

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-17 remain in the application and claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 13, 15, and 17 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 17 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al.

A feature of the present invention is a terminal device including a slot for inserting and ejecting a memory device that stores information for user authentication (e.g. username/password).

Another feature of the present invention is that when the terminal device detects that the memory device is inserted into the slot, a request for authentication is sent to a network server by sending the information for user authentication and information about the terminal being used (e.g. a TV). When the network server authenticates the user, the information for user authentication is stored in the network server in association with the information about the terminal for future communication with the terminal associated with the information about the terminal.

See page 12, line 21 to page 15 line 21 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 13, 15, and 17 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

The Office action concedes that Lee et al. fails to show or suggest the above-noted features of the present invention and cites Floden et al. as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that Floden et al. is merely teaching a GSM system wherein authentication information is stored in a SIM card, and when the SIM card is inserted into a slot of a cellular telephone, authentication is performed at the server side or the client side.

However, Floden et al. fails to show or suggest that authentication information is sent from a client to a server along with information about terminal specification.

Further, Floden et al. fails to show or suggest that authentication information is stored on the server in association with the information about the terminal specification for future communication with the terminal device associated with the information about the terminal specification.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 2, 7, 13, 15, and 17, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Lee et al.

in view of Floden et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 4-6, 9, and 10 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and Boyle et al.

Independent claims 4 and 9 have been amended to recite the above-noted features of the present invention now recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15, and 17 and, for the same reasons stated above, claims 4 and 9 are submitted to be patentably distinct over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and, because there are no features in Boyle et al. that somehow could be combined with Lee et al. and Floden et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 4 and 9, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and Boyle et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and Bodin.

The rejection over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. has been addressed above.

It is respectfully submitted that Bodin is merely teaching a mobile system that deletes the stored information in the terminal device and not in the server, as in the presently claimed invention, when the SIM card is removed from the terminal device.


Further, Bodin fails to show or suggest that the terminal device sends an erase request to the server when the memory device is removed and that the stored information on the server is deleted when the authentication is verified.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 14 and 16 are patentably distinct over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and Bodin.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb